

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DUGAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

No. C 12-02549 WHA

v.


LLOYDS TSB BANK, PLC.,
Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART
AND DENYING IN PART
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
SEAL (DKT. NO. 347)**

Defendant has filed an administrative motion to seal. In *Kamakana v. Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006), the Ninth Circuit held that *more* than good cause, indeed, “compelling reasons” are required to seal documents used in dispositive motions. Compelling reasons have not been shown to seal the two lines in defendant’s motion for summary judgment and thus the request is **DENIED**. The request to seal four excerpts of defendant’s exhibits contained in the Khula declaration is **GRANTED**. The request to seal Exhibit 20 which contains internal practices and procedures for loan products is **GRANTED**. The request to seal Exhibit 39 which contains a business proposal and repricing information is **GRANTED**. The request to seal pages 3 and 4 of Exhibit 40 which contain pricing and funding data is **GRANTED**. The request to seal Exhibit 42 which contains formulas and loan data is **GRANTED**. Compelling reasons have not been shown to seal pages 2 and 3 of Exhibit 43 and thus the request is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 19, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE